

## REMARKS

Applicant has carefully reviewed and considered the Office Action mailed on July 16, 2003, and the references cited therewith.

Claims 10-22 are withdrawn; as a result, claims 1-28 are now pending in this application.

## Drawings

The drawings were objected to due to informalities. Drawing corrections are submitted with this Amendment and Response.

## §102 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1-3 and 5 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Zink et al. (U.S. 5,963,045). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and requests the Office to consider the following.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." (*Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987), M.P.E.P. §2131, 8<sup>th</sup> Ed., Rev. 1).

Zink does not teach the limitation in claim 1 of an "extension board". The structure in Zink is a test fixture 166 (FIG. 11) that does not couple to the circuit board 145, rather, it is "brought into alignment so that test probes 154-160 will engage conductive pads 146-152. Zink's test fixture 166 is not a board. Consequently, claims 1-5 are not anticipated by Zink.

Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-9 and 23-28 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Korsunsky et al. (U.S. 5,383,095). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and requests the Office to consider the following.

Korsunsky does not teach the limitations in independent claims 1, 6, 23, and 26 of an "extension board". The structure in Korsunsky is an electrical connector 10 that cannot be construed to be a board. Further as to independent claims 23 and 26, Korsunsky fails to teach

any functionality "for maintaining said top surface of said extension board relatively coplanar with said top surface of said printed circuit board" (claim 23, e.g.). Consequently, claims 1-9 and 23-28 are not anticipated by Korsunsky. Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney, John Greaves at (801) 278-9171, or the below signed attorney to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743

Respectfully submitted,

TOM E. PEARSON ET AL.

By their Representatives,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.  
P.O. Box 2938  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402  
(612) 349-9592

Date Sept. 16, 2003

By Ann M. McCrackin

Ann M. McCrackin  
Reg. No. 42,858

**CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8:** The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: MS Non-Fee Amendment, Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 16 day of September, 2003.

Name

Emily Bates

Signature

Emily Bates